HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 38 Saturday, September 22, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

High Level — Low Barometer: "General Eisenhower never won a military campaign without going on the offensive," was one somewhat bitter comment on the commencement of the White House-designed campaign. A storm of discontent from party rank and file is reported to GOP Headquarters, particularly with the "new Nixon" role which obviously sits very uncomfortably on the unfortunate Vice President. When Nixon, reportedly on orders from Ike, praised Adlai Stevenson after the latter finally and with manifest reluctance admitted Hiss was a spy, the GOP pros showed evident displeasure.

The only GOP campaigner who meets the specifications of the professional brethren is Senator Knowland, who as he started his cross-country speaking tour frankly underlined his intention to make "Communists in Government" an open fighting issue in the campaign, thus flatly ignoring Ike's statement last week that it would not be. The California Senator told Washington reporters that the Hiss and Harry Dexter White cases raised legitimate questions of whether Adlai Stevenson, if elected, would reappoint the same officials charged with carelessness in dealing with Communists in Government under the Truman Administration. "Maybe Stevenson," he warned, "is going to ask the same group, Acheson and others, who advised Truman — to advise him." That's the really effective way of punching, say the pros.

● The GOP professionals' concern — that no unified fighting strategy exists — is fed by a story which is firmly believed in some quarters of the GOP, but which is difficult to confirm, so much is intraparty maneuvering enveloped in a mist of discretions and denials. The story is this:

Former Governor Dewey sent word to the White House, just a few days before the meeting of the N. Y. State GOP Convention, saying that he would be willing — if Ike publicly requested him — to run as Republican Senatorial candidate against Wagner this Fall. Now, even his bitterest enemies have always conceded that Tom Dewey could win any such contest; and the advantage of Dewey on the ticket with Ike and Dick would be tremendous in this key state.

Yet, so the story runs, the offer got as far as Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams in the White House — and then silence. No answer was received by the New York Republican leaders up to the deadline for calling together the State Committee to make the nomination. The interpretation was that the Palace Guard was not willing to make the request. Somewhat resentfully and lamely, the Executive Committee — after bitter dissension — voted 12 to 8 for Javits. They felt they could do nothing else, with Dewey out of it.

The pros blame the White House and comment, "It's a hell of a way to run a railroad."

● "Mr. Stevenson has adopted Harry Truman's old principle that Democrats — not independents — win elections for Democrats," reports Martin Hayden of NANA in the Washington *Star* (September 16). The fact that Stevenson is running on the coat-tails of strong local and state Democratic candidates and machines — like that of Muskie in Maine — is recognized by many observers here.

This realization impresses some GOP advisers, who now are studying the Maine and other state results. They note reports from here and there that "independence of Ike" was by no means a handicap in some of the primaries, notably Wisconsin, where some members of Congress profited by such independence. Senator Knowland, in his cross-country speaking tour, emphasizes the necessity of "Republican victory" — not just "Ike victory." Hence there are some who offer the advice that the high command had better realize that "Republicans — not Democrats — win elections for Republicans." This is fortified by some who

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are wondering how many votes T. Coleman Andrews, States' Rights candidate, will swing away from the Republicans in some states. (See item below.)

● As the week ends, and the conclusions drawn from Maine, Washington and other election battle grounds sink in, betting odds on Ike in Washington (two weeks ago, 3 to 1) reportedly have dropped to 6 to 5.

States' Rights Ticket: The National States' Rights Conference in Memphis, Tennessee, met on September 14 and 15, and ended, after some tumultuous debating, by rejecting creation of a "third party," but also by endorsing a ticket of T. Coleman Andrews of Virginia for President and former Congressman Thomas E. Werdel of California for Vice President. Southerners who wanted to support these two men had objected to formation of a formal third party, mindful of the hold which the Democratic Party has on large parts of the South. Andrews, traditionally a Democrat and friend of Byrd, served for over two years as Commissioner of Internal Revenue under Eisenhower. Werdel, a Republican, won fame in 1952 by the considerable support he drew in his fight with "liberal" Governor Earl Warren.

A prominent Louisiana political figure, John U. Barr, skillfully steered the debates and proceedings through some acrimonious conflicts into a fairly harmonious ending; and, under his leadership, attempts (by various crackpots) to infiltrate the gathering were squelched. In the end, delegates from 24 states "nominated" Andrews and Werdel. Reporters present say that twelve states will have one or another "independent" conservative group of electors favorable to the Andrews-Werdel ticket on the ballot in November.

The twelve are: Alabama, Arkansas, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Mexico, New Jersey, South Carolina, Tennessee and Texas. "For America," a sponsor of the Memphis meeting, claims that chances are good for adding several more states to this list, and also mentions plans for a write-in-campaign in other states.

A statement of T. Coleman Andrews read at the Conference, described how the "degeneration" of the two major parties "into two groups with a common collectivist pattern and dedicated to uncontrolled spending, devouring taxation, suppression and ultimate elimination of the states, absolute supremacy of the central Government, increasing involvement of the country in foreign entanglements, and eventual surrender of our sovereignty to some sort of world government, is well on the way to becoming an accomplished fact and the two party system now exists in name only." A "platform" calls for relief from these and other afflictions of the electorate. (Detailed information on the Andrews-Werdel candidacy can be obtained from "For America," 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C.)

Stevenson: Now that Stevenson has set up his campaign headquarters in Washington's Sheraton Park Hotel, the Capital press corps has taken its first good look at the "new Adlai" and his entourage. First impressions here are that, for a man who glorifies the proletariat, Adlai seems overly attracted to wealth. Having inherited stock now worth over a million dollars and having married a Borden heiress, the Democratic candidate has surrounded himself with his own kind: people who, by inheritance or marriage, have fallen into a fortune. A few of them are: William McCormick Blair (International Harvester); C. K. McClatchy (Sacramento-Fresno newspapers and radio); Philip Stern (a Rosenwald); Mrs. Edison Dick (A. B. Dick mimeograph); Barry Bingham (Louisville *Courier-Journal*).

● As a counterweight to '52 eggheadery, Stevenson now has Jim Finnegan, described by close observers of the campaign as another Jim Farley. Wilson Wyatt, campaign manager in 1952, now bears the title of "Assistant to the Candidate and Coordinator of Affairs." No one is sure just what that means.

● Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., reputed to have been the mastermind of 1952's losing effort, is still around, as are other double-domes. But even here things have changed. For instance, Adlai-adviser Professor J. Kenneth Galbraith is no diffident egghead: he tells everyone that he has a big hand in writing Adlai's speeches, and often points out the particular parts authored by him. (It is true, however, that the final draft is always Stevenson's own.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Adlai Stevenson had by July of the same year developed a popular demand that he run for the Presidency. This is precisely as credible as a glorious-leader editorial in *Pravda*. But phony as the Johnson book obviously is, it is probably right about one thing. The regular political leaders of the Democratic party did not rig the Stevenson "draft," and to this day Harry Truman, for example, probably does not know what happened. One must look elsewhere than to the traditional Democrat machinery to find that Stevenson was not his own man. He can thus command his own entourage like a prince, for they can find no way to go around him. This would hardly have been believed before this year's Democratic Convention. Now it can hardly be doubted.

Granted that he is the boss, or a boss, why compare him to Capone? It is inevitable that a Democratic Governor of Illinois in our time should emit a faint odor of gangland. How else? Can you be a Democratic Governor of Illinois without an understanding with the political bosses of Chicago — where you must get the bulk of your vote? Can the political bosses of Chicago operate without an understanding with gangland? Stevenson's police action in Chicago was as moderate, in effect, as Truman's police action in Korea. The gangs and the Communists still flourish.

I understand that the foregoing reflections will be thought unfair, or daring. But, ah, my foes, and, oh, my friends, I am heartened in the pursuit of these natural inferences by none other than Governor Stevenson and Senator Kefauver themselves. In Chicago on Friday, October 6, 1950, the Governor testified before the Senator's celebrated crime-investigating Committee, and the following exchange occurred:

> *Mr. Robinson* [Associate Counsel for the Committee]: "It also has been indicated, Governor, that this so-called syndicate through shady ward committeemen controls several thousand votes in Illinois. Do you have any comment to make on that?"
>
> *Governor Stevenson:* "None except *the obvious one* [italics added] that if they are as powerful as they appear to be, I would imagine they certainly did . . ." (Kefauver Committee *Hearings*, Part 5, Page 218.)

It *is* obvious when you think about it, isn't it?

It was obvious to Senator Kefauver also. "There was no doubt in the minds of any of us, after the sort of testimony we heard in Chicago, that organized crime and political corruption go hand in hand, and that in fact there could be no big-time organized crime without a firm and profitable alliance between those who run the rackets and those in political control." (Estes Kefauver, *Crime in America*. Doubleday & Co., 1951. Page 88.)

But the matter is complicated. Small wonder that Adlai told the Los Angeles Town Hall luncheon, "I'm frank to say I get a little confused about corruption in politics."

Estes is lenient with Adlai, but not so lenient with Adlai's friend, Colonel Jacob M. Arvey. Summarizing the Committee's investigation in Chicago, Kefauver says, "One of the aftermaths of the campaign, incidentally, was the resignation in Chicago of Jack Arvey as leader of the Cook County Democratic organization." (Kefauver, *op. cit.*, Page 58.)

Don't you think that is sort of interesting? I mean, Arvey is the man who put Stevenson into politics, and a gang-busting exposé hitting Arvey put Kefauver on television. Now Stevenson and Kefauver are a ticket. You and I may not know the details of crime and politics in Illinois, but we can read what the Democratic Nominee for Vice President says about the patron of the Democratic Nominee for President.

That *Adlai uses the method of Machiavelli* is not an insult, but a statement of fact. It is a fact of considerable philosophical interest and ought somewhere to be dilated more than is possible here. The contrast with Machiavelli is, of course, Jefferson. The latter is deductive, the former inductive. Jefferson begins with abstract principles, Machiavelli with concrete situations. Perhaps the main reason why the traditional politicians have been unhorsed by Stevenson is that they thought he was abstract because his vocabulary is academic. As we have seen, Adlai is not really so very academic himself, but he has lots of academics on tap. The ones close to him are a far cry from the layman's conception of an idealistic ivory-tower dreamer. Adlai relies on academics like Dr. Joseph D. Lohman of the University of Chicago (who in 1951 told a conference of Federal personnel officers that they must end segregation for the very practical reason that "the Negro is on the make"), and like Professor Harry Kalven, Jr., who helped draft the 1952 speech in which Indiana's Governor Henry Schricker nominated Stevenson.

The *Daily Worker* of February 14, 1955, reported (Page 3) that "Professor Harry Kalven, of the University of Chicago," was a speaker at a dinner

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"under the auspices of the Chicago Sobell Committee at the Hamilton Hotel," honoring atomic egghead Harold C. Urey, who took the occasion to declare that "injustice had been done" to Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. I imagine it's the same Harry Kalven.

Harry Kalven, Jr., was also in on that planting of microphones in jury rooms — a scientific endeavor not to be confused with FBI wire-tapping — financed by the Ford Foundation and interrupted by the Department of Justice.

ADLAI STEVENSON represents the most dangerous class of men in America today — the capitalists who are determined to survive capitalism. While Frederick Vanderbilt Field and Corliss Lamont have accustomed us to the idea that there are such people, we must not imagine that they are typical. Field and Lamont have developed some kind of emotional attachment to the Soviet Union, great enough so that they will sacrifice their reputations, if not too much of their money, in Soviet causes. More dangerous, because more numerous and more practical, are the American leaders in business, law and finance who have concluded that the trend is to Communism, and that the best we can look forward to is, in Adlai Stevenson's words, "coexistence in this world with a ruthless, inscrutable, and equal power in the world." This is the adoption of the Communist line — that Soviet Russia is equal in power to the United States (a fantastically false proposition), and that the answer is "coexistence."

Capitalists who urge coexistence with Communism are dangerously close to assuming the role described in the *Communist Manifesto:* "Finally, in times when the class struggle nears the decisive hour, a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift, and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands."

As you read that and think about the rich and well bred people in the Americans for Democratic Action, you cannot help thinking: These people certainly make Marx and Engels look good. Then you remember that some of these people, who are much like Engels, believe Marx and want to make him look good.

Men who imagine that they comprehend theoretically historical movements as a whole, and think they see that, in Adlai Stevenson's words, "The ordeal of the twentieth century . . . is far from over . . . that there are no gains without pains . . . that we are now on the eve of great decisions" — if such men also "like to win" what will be their temptations?

Whittaker Chambers said that he was leaving the winning side for the losing. I reject his analysis but admire his spirit. There are men of means and cultivation who evidently accept his analysis and are contemptuous of his spirit. What will they leave and what join?

I see in the papers that Hiss spoke at Princeton and that Oppenheimer will lecture at Harvard. What is the name of that recent egghead book in extenuation of Benedict Arnold?

No, this is not Prince Hamlet, nor Elsinore at all.

This is Versailles and the nobility at the court of Louis XVI on the eve of their guillotine, as described by a survivor, the Count de Ségur:

> "Though the forms of the edifice remained intact, we did not realize that it was being undermined from within . . . . We . . . applauded the philosophical discourses of our academicians, and the bold writings of our men of letters . . . . There is a pleasure in stooping so long as one is certain of being able to raise oneself again at will. Thus with no foresight for the future, we enjoyed both the advantages of aristocracy and the sweets of plebian philosophy."

I have an anachronistic nightmare in which I see the ADA meeting at Versailles to eat cake with Napoleon, and unobtrusively among them is Count Quisling.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Medford Evans, author of *Secret War for the A-Bomb* (Regnery), is Professor of Social Sciences at Northwestern College, Natchitoches, Louisiana, and a contributing editor of *National Review.* Dr. Evans was formerly Chief of Training for the Atomic Energy Commission and Editor of *Facts Forum.* His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "They First Make Mad," March 26, 1955.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

● Reporters who have followed Stevenson on his cross-country marathon arrived in Washington worn out. They relayed that in Los Angeles, where Adlai and Estes were greeted by an eager mob "larger than the one that met Elvis 'the Pelvis' Presley," the Democratic appeal to the "little people" paid off. Kefauver has co-opted Presley as "a fine boy from Tennessee," and the L. A. mob, appropriately enough, was described as an "Elvis Presley" turnout — i.e., ducktailed juveniles. These Presleyites, it is said, came to see The Keef, whom they consider as one of their own. (Presley himself, however, has expressed a preference for Stevenson. "Ah don't dig this intellectual bit," Elvis is quoted, "but, man, he knows the most.")

Suez: "The real problem in Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal is not the Canal," says Senator Jenner who insists it is whether Nasser will succeed, by stirring up this dispute, in creating hatred between the Western nations and the 350 million Arabs and Moslems of the world.

Jenner says that Egypt has "a sovereign right" to nationalize the Canal, pointing out that the British who nationalized some of their big industries have no moral right to protest. Nor should the United States favor the British plans to "internationalize" the Canal or to pass over control to the United Nations. "It is in the American interest," says the Indianan, "to oppose any precedent for internationalizing the Panama Canal. . . ."

But what of the obstreperous Nasser? "By doing business with a gun in his hand, Nasser has simply reduced his credit rating. He has said by his acts that he does not wish to qualify as a borrower of the savings of people in other countries to help his countrymen get more food and jobs. His quarrel is with his own people, not with us."

What should we do? "Suez is a Communist red herring and the men who guide international policy must be smart enough not to be diverted by Red herrings." Jenner urges us instead to look to our barricades in the rest of the world, see that Germany gets along with her rearmament, that Korea receives the proper arms, that Free China on Formosa is buttressed with aid, that we trumpet to the world that the satellite nations of Eastern Europe must have free elections, etc. etc. When the Arabs see us following such a policy, they will be convinced that we will not appease the Reds. Then they will come round to our side.

Labor Front: Fear that the notorious Harry Bridges might try to organize East Coast dock workers into his International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union is reported to have been an important factor in AFL-CIO President George Meany's decision to talk peace with the head of the orphaned International Longshoremen's Association.

Expelled from the pre-merger AFL in 1953 as racketeer and gangster controlled, the ILA now claims to have cleaned itself up and would like back in the House of Organized Labor. In such fashion, it also would like to absorb the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen, which was set up by the AFL for the express purpose of trying to displace the ILA in East Coast ports, and thus end the jurisdictional disputes threatening the ILA's hold on those ports.

Bridges has been known to be eyeing Eastern ports enviously for some time and belief has been growing that if the ILA-IBL controversy continues, he would try to muscle his ILWU into the territory. That, neither the AFL-CIO nor the Government nor the East Coast residents would want. Bridges' trouble-making and Communist proclivities already have caused more than enough difficulty along the West Coast and in Hawaii — is the consensus.

Trade Inquiry: Without fuss or fanfare, a House Ways and Means Subcommittee headed by Democratic Representative Hale Boggs of Louisiana this week launched what ultimately is intended to be a full-dress inquiry to determine whether current foreign trade policies basically help or hinder the national economy.

To the surprise of no one, two of the first day's witnesses turned out to be Harvard professors; but to the amazement of most observers, both turned out to be critical of the "trade, not aid" thesis and of indiscriminate lowering of American tariff barriers. They were Dean Edward S. Mason of the University's School of Public Administration and Professor Seymour E. Harris, Chairman of its Economics Department.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Both decried tariff reductions which put men out of work and companies out of business unless they can be absorbed promptly in other segments of the economy. They agreed that some weak industries which are unable to meet foreign competition probably will die out ultimately in the natural course of events; but they also agreed that to hasten this process by lowering barriers against importation of foreign-competition goods can only heighten the problem.

Harris, who doubles as Chairman of the New England Governors Textile Committee, argued that the American textile industry is the heaviest sufferer from growing sales here of Japanese-made products. He was joined by Mason in contending that if tariffs are to be slashed, "strong" industries such as automobiles, chemicals and electronics, should be made to shoulder their share of the tariff cutting burden, as well as "weak" industries like textiles.

Farm Front: Capital observers believe that one sidelight but important result of the Democratic Senatorial primary victory in Colorado of former Representative John A. Carroll will be the permanent interment of the unlamented Brannan farm-aid plan.

The reason, of course, is that Carroll won the nomination in a surprise victory over Charles A. Brannan, Truman Administration Secretary of Agriculture, whose main claim to fame is as originator of the completely socialistic agricultural program bearing his name.

Brannan never before had essayed any race for elective office but in this primary had the enthusiastic support of left-wing organizations such as the National Farmers Union (for which he now is General Counsel) and the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union (expelled from the CIO six years ago because of its Communist domination), both of which have strong units in Colorado.

Also, Brannan made a strong primary argument of the fact that Carroll twice had won the Democratic Senatorial nomination (in 1950 and 1954) but each time had gone down to defeat in November. Primarily for these reasons, Brannan became the betting favorite.

Assaying the narrow Carroll victory, Democratic strategists now feel that the most plausible interpretation of it is that the majority of Colorado Democrats want no part of the Brannan plan, and that such an unexpected result should be taken as a warning to permit that scheme to rest in peace. They note that in general, Carroll is fully as far to the left as is the former Cabineteer; *ergo*, they feel the difference must have been the latter's identification with his favorite farm program.

Billions, Blunders and Baloney: According to data from the International Monetary Fund, the United States Government is funneling tax dollars to foreign countries at the rate of $5 billion a year. This figure includes foreign aid and Government purchases, but does *not* include military goods given outright. The $5 billion annually constitutes about 30 per cent of all the dollars acquired by the rest of the world.

These figures — so goes the talk on Capitol Hill — may well stir up voters who have been asking what their tax money is buying.

Letter from VERY REVEREND PAUL L. O'CONNOR, S.J., President, Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio: "I have written a letter to Mr. Lee J. Wimberg expressing thanks for his kindness in having HUMAN EVENTS sent to me for the coming year. I am sure that not only I, but also anyone that runs across it in our library, will be grateful to him."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright, 1956.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIII, No. 38 HUMAN EVENTS September 22, 1956

Article Section

THE SOPHOMORES ARE COMING

The Phenomenal Growth of the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists

By Frank Chodorov

Change is the special province of the sophomore. He revels in it. Biologically and intellectually, he is in the process of change from adolescence into manhood; he is growing into something different from the condition he had become accustomed to and the transition makes him susceptible to all change.

Nature has endowed the sophomore with an insatiable curiosity about the world in which he is about to play an important part, and with a penchant for the ideal, the perfect. He has little patience with the "practical" unless it coincides with what he conceives to be "right." And if he finds the going order below par, as he sees it, he has the indomitable confidence of youth to set about removing the deficiency. He is for change.

What change is he for? Whatever promises the ideal. Lacking experience, he is likely to pick up a formula for improvement concocted by older hands, provided it is properly garnished with promise. Thus, when depression hit the country a generation ago, the idealistic sophomore took to the formula of the New Deal simply because it was heralded as the way to uplift the "one-third" who were "ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed." Here was a plan that promised what "ought to be" and he put his youth into it.

That sophomore is now middle-aged. He has a family to look after, a good job to protect, a corporation to run; hence, he lacks the instinct to fight for change, even if in his reflective moments he realizes that the New Deal was a false promise. From him, we can expect no re-evaluation of the world in which he has spent the better part of his life.

There are a number who were sophomores long, long before there was a New Deal, men who remember a different kind of life and who are, therefore, insistent on change. But, they are too few in number, too burdened with the disillusionment of age, too inadequate in spirit to effect a change. Not until a new crop of sophomores grab a new ideal will the country emerge from the cloud of collectivism in which it is embraced.

Four years ago, it will be recalled, the pre-New Deal sophomores hailed the advent of Mr. Eisenhower as the signal for a change. It did not come. It should now be obvious that the policy of interventionism and subventionism is not to be altered by a mere change in Administration; it will take a change in the climate of thought to put into office men who will jettison that policy.

That is to say, the country is in dire need of a new revolution in attitudes, to overcome the revolution of 1932. Such a revolution can come only from the colleges, where thought takes root, is fertilized by the enthusiasm of youth and is nurtured by confidence into action.

Such a revolution is in the making. It is embryonic and will hardly have any effect on the 1956 election and probably not on that of 1960. But, it is also ominous in that it is the first evidence of disillusionment on the campus with the

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

collectivism that the fathers of these students put upon the country. It is full of promise.

IN THE PAST YEAR, over 4,000 students, spread among 400 colleges, enrolled in the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists. It is a self-selected group of students who are dissatisfied with things as they are and are searching for betterment.

Each year the management of ISI (some pre-New Deal sophomores) offers to send college students books, pamphlets and periodicals that point up the deficiencies of collectivism, in theory and in practice, and lay stress on the philosophy of individualism. The character of this literature is described by some professors as "reactionary," "fascist," "turning back the clock." But the students see something else in the material, for they ask for it. None is sent to them unless they do, and with every piece the recipient is advised that getting off the list of the ISI is as easy as signing the enclosed card. There is also another card, an enrollment card, to be handed to another student. The drop-outs are few, the enrollments are many. Also, the students are encouraged to pass the literature around, and in that way new names are added to the list.

All of the literature is uncompromising in its advocacy of limited government and free enterprise, either on principle or in its analyses of current events. It is an interesting commentary on the trend that the library of libertarian tracts, books and periodicals has been growing by leaps and bounds in the last decade; ten years ago there was a dire paucity of it, and if one wanted to read about libertarianism, one had to dig into the Nineteenth Century.

Some of the pamphlets sent to ISI students are prepared by competent authors, some are being published by public-minded corporations, some are the issues of foundations dedicated to the promotion of the philosophy of freedom. Most of the students receive the weekly issues of HUMAN EVENTS, thanks to generous donors of subscriptions. Books too are made available to students on request; among the titles offered them — about twenty-five all told—are *Economics in One Lesson, One Is a Crowd, The Law, The Road Ahead, Fiat Money in France, McCarthy and His Enemies, Mainstream, What Social Classes Owe to Each Other, The Income Tax: Root of All Evil.* Altogether, nearly 500,000 pieces have been mailed to the 10,000 students who have enrolled since ISI was started late in 1952.

ISI has no organizational program, although students are encouraged to form discussion groups, which they have done in a number of colleges. The principle on which ISI operates is that right action can follow only from right thought, and that the great need of the times is the dissemination of libertarian ideas. When in due time, the students are convinced that "something ought to be done about it" they will have a philosophy by which to judge the desirability of that "something."

It is no secret that for over twenty years the college student has been fed a collectivistic fare; individualism has been presented to him, if at all, as a horrible example. It is not strange therefore that letters from ISI students record a startling reaction: the ideas are "new," "different," "never heard on the campus." Only occasionally does a student recognize that these ideas are the same that have stirred students from the time of Voltaire to FDR.

Ideas have, on the student mind, an impact to which the rutted mind is impervious. And so the mail from ISI students indicates a serious questioning of the *status quo;* also some questioning of professorial dicta (often at the risk of being "flunked") and a refusal to accept without discussion the value judgments in their textbooks. A few students have broken out into print against the socialism on the campus, and in several cases, their brashness has resulted in disciplinary action by the authorities. One student's right-wing "radicalism" cost him the editorship of his college paper.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The hundreds of letters from ISI students are heartening indeed — especially to the pre-New Deal sophomore who has abandoned hope. This story would be far more interesting and thrilling if we could reprint some of them. But, to do so might cause the writers some inconvenience, if their names were disclosed, and anonymous letters carry no more weight than a summary of their import. It is enough to say that the age-old stirring for change is in the hearts of these students.

Among other things revealed by ISI mail is that the faculties are far from one hundred per cent *status quo*. There are professors in every college who are opposed to the socialistic trend, often openly, and even to the extent of finding fault with the textbooks they are compelled to use. A number of these professors have advised students to enroll in ISI. Incidentally, this is particularly true of the denominational colleges.

EVERY JUNE, nearly a third of the year's membership is lost, either through graduation or failure to return to college. To make up in part for these losses, every summer ISI asks friends and relatives of students to send in their names and college addresses. These names do not go on the list automatically; rather, the students receive notice that they will be enrolled if they so desire. They must ask for the literature. Sometimes a student will resent his "aunt's" intrusion in his affairs. (Names and addresses sent to HUMAN EVENTS will be appreciated.)

By Christmas, the drop-outs are replaced with new names, mostly at the solicitation of students receiving the literature, and the list continues to grow until June. The cumulative effect of the literature is shown by the fact that during the past April more memberships were received than in any other month.

The organization was started in February of 1953. About 600 students joined up. In the college year 1953-4 over 2,600 enrolled; the list came to 3,700 in 1954-5, and to over 4,000 in 1955-6. How many of these incipient rebels are there on the campus?

ISI plans to find at least 10,000 during the coming year, and believes an extensive campaign would bring out 100,000.

The present program — finances permitting — calls for the activating of a lecture bureau, to supplement the literature. Reading, of course, is far more educative than listening, but a lecturer can stir up interest in a subject and thus encourage individual investigation. Among the lecturers who have volunteered their services (for expenses only) are a number of professors who are opposed to the collectivistic trend and are anxious to do their bit toward reversing it. One function of the lecture bureau will be to bring together the libertarian students, often unknown to one another, and thus encourage the formation of discussion groups.

A student publication is also in the offing. It will be called *The Individualist* and only students will be asked to contribute to it. Many of the letters received at headquarters indicate a verve for writing as well as a keen understanding of the philosophy of freedom; they would make good articles. Also, news of libertarian activities on the various campuses will tend to stimulate those who find that fighting the trend is a lonesome job.

Other plans will be deferred until the wherewithal to activate them is available; for instance, an employment bureau that will put employers in touch with graduates who have shown an enthusiasm for free enterprise. ISI is supported by voluntary contributions.

POLITICAL UPHEAVALS are necessarily preceded by social unrest, which in turn follows from a reorientation of thought. The idea of constitutionalism — government of limited powers — was kicked around in intellectual circles for many years before it came to grips with the "divine right of kings." It took many decades for the concepts of Locke, Voltaire and Rousseau to take effect, but eventually they inflamed the American Revolution, inspired the Declaration of Independence and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

found practical expression in the American Constitution. Marxist ideas were the exclusive possession of insignificant debaters until, after World War I, the ideas caught on in our colleges, and out of the socialist clubs that sprang up on the campus came the "brain trusters" who gave Roosevelt a public policy.

Yes, ideas do have consequences. But the consequences do not show up until long after the ideas have been planted. Before the thought-seed can flower into a social pattern and a political implementation, it must fight its way through the foliage of the past. And right now — is there any doubt about it? — the prevailing thought pattern in this country, and in the whole world, is collectivism.

That is the fact that those who clamor for change are wont to overlook — that collectivism has pretty well pre-empted the minds of the people. It is the *status quo* of the present. It cannot be upset by a political *coup d'état,* by a change of the praetorian guard. As long as people in general, and particularly the moulders of thought, worship at the shrine of socialism, the ruling regime must be guided by its precepts. The Eisenhower Administration could not have given us anything much different from what it did, even if it wanted to, because it was itself dominated by the intellectual climate of the times.

Those of us who look upon socialism in all its forms as the worship of false gods are of necessity cast into the role of radicals. We are radicals, first, because we root our thought in basic and immutable principle, and secondly, because our aim is to replace the prevailing pattern of thought with what we conceive to be a sounder one. We do not aim to "turn back the clock," but rather to go forward to the ideal of freedom. We are for change.

THE WORK of the radical is first of all to plant ideas. And the most promising soil for this work is the developing and fertile mind of the young student. It is receptive, unencumbered with ritual, searching for the ideal. If the American way of life is to be reoriented toward freedom, it will be done only by those who in the future will be called upon to do the job, and only if they are equipped with the intellectual tools. Hence, education is the only realistic occupation of the present day radical. Not that political effort must be set aside, but it must be kept in mind that political activity can only be educative in effect, things being as they are, and that in itself it will not bring about the result expected. Elections only record what people think.

It is this radicalism of the philosophy of freedom that appeals to the sophomore. He likes the idealism in it, he takes to it because it satisfies his natural inclination for change. It equips him with ammunition to be used against his sworn "enemy," the dictatorial professor, and it strengthens him in his arguments with conformist students, thus lifting him above the mob. The radical is a rare bird, even on the campus; the history of mankind shows that very few are endowed with that extra bit of intellectual curiosity that is the taproot of radicalism. Only the student so endowed takes to the philosophy of freedom. All the better. For it is only that kind of student who can make any dent on the pattern of thought.

The purpose of the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists is to find that student and to equip him with a philosophy. More exactly, he finds himself when the philosophy is presented to him.

To be more effective, ISI needs more names of receptive students. Readers of HUMAN EVENTS are asked to send in such names and their college addresses.

If you wish to help pay for gift subscriptions of HUMAN EVENTS to be sent to ISI members, send your check made out to the "Intercollegiate Society of Individualists." Address it "in care of HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C." College-year subscriptions (8 months) are $6.50. You can pay for five such subscriptions for $32.50; 10 for $65; 20 for $130; 100 for $650.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED